

**MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

September 21, 2002

Carefree Inn
Carefree, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Mayor Neil Giuliano, Tempe, Chair
Mayor Elaine Scruggs, Glendale, Vice Chair
* Senator Linda Aguirre, Arizona Senate
Benito Almanza, Bank of America Arizona
F. Rockne Arnett, Citizens Transportation
Oversight Committee
* Mayor Bill Arnold, Goodyear
Mayor Steven Berman, Gilbert
Steve Berry, Swift Transportation
Councilmember Peggy Bilsten, Phoenix
Representative Dean Cooley, Arizona House
Councilmember Pat Dennis, Peoria
Mayor Ron Drake, Avondale

Mayor Boyd Dunn, Chandler
Rusty Gant, ADOT
Mayor Keno Hawker, Mesa
Eneas Kane, DMB Associates
Mayor Mary Manross, Scottsdale
Mayor Lon McDermott, Wickenburg
* James Pulice, Jr., Pulice Construction
Diane Scherer, Phoenix Association of Realtors
Vice Mayor Daniel Schweiker, Paradise Valley
* Martin Shultz, Pinnacle West Capital Corp.
Supervisor Don Stapley, Maricopa County
Mayor J. Woodfin Thomas, Litchfield Park

* Not present

Welcome and Purpose

The meeting of the Transportation Policy Committee was called to order by Chairman Neil Giuliano, Tempe, at 8:30 a.m. Chairman Giuliano expressed thanks to MAG staff for the meeting arrangements. He welcomed all and thanked Committee members for serving. Self introductions followed. Mayor Wendy Feldman-Kerr, Chair of the MAG Regional Council, welcomed the Transportation Policy Committee via a videotaped address. Mayor Feldman-Kerr spoke about the role of the TPC to make recommendations to the Regional Council on the Regional Transportation Plan.

Chairman Giuliano provided logistics for the operations of the Committee. He stated that this is a tremendous opportunity and a bit of an experiment. Chairman Giuliano stated that the development of the new transportation plan is being undertaken in the way that has never been done before by a significant entity and may serve as a model for other MPOs.

Chairman Giuliano stated that this process reminded him of the time in grade school when the teacher would draw a tree and wanted everyone to draw the tree. The only problem was, it was her vision of what a tree should look like. He added that none of us will be able to draw a tree that will be the tree for everyone, but all will have a hand in drawing it. Chairman Giuliano commented on all coming together and creating the best possible plan.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the underlying principles of the process will be honesty and integrity in both relationships and data, respect and fairness for everyone's views. Chairman Giuliano stated that it will be a public inclusionary process, where honesty will be a foundational aspect.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the Committee will have a very accelerated process to deal with policy decisions that need to be made in the next 18-24 months. He added that meeting attendance will be very important because the decisions made in one meeting will be the foundation for the next decision. Chairman Giuliano stated that if a member misses three meetings in a row, their place on the committee will be filled so the group can move forward. He noted that because of the significance of the Committee's work and that some of the positions are designated positions, it would not work well in the environment to send a proxy, so proxies would not be allowed. Chairman Giuliano stated that he encouraged members to submit their comments in writing if they are unable to attend a meeting, so that their views would always be a part of the process. He stated that we want to make sure the data is amended as members want it amended, so full disclosure is available for all. Chairman Giuliano stated that this a great opportunity, a great challenge and responsibility. He requested feedback. Chairman Giuliano stated that he tends to be a driver and looks for consensus quickly, but not before all are comfortable to move on. He noted there are some decisions that need to be made by October, but feedback is welcome if he drives too hard.

Vice Chair Elaine Scruggs stated that she believed that with hard work, the Committee can come up with a plan to offer to the citizens. The Committee needs to stay the course and follow a very aggressive schedule. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that in 1985, she was tapped by George Renner to work on a very top-down plan. She added that will not work anymore. The citizens will not allow projects to be thrown out there. A plan with solutions is needed with the understanding that not all will agree with everything, but all will get something. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the plan needs to have enough for everyone to embrace the plan and for all parts of the Valley to support the plan. She noted that our citizens strongly support better air quality, transportation, and quality of life. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that each Committee member will add much to this process.

Dave Berry asked how MAG came to be in charge of the half cent sales tax. Chairman Giuliano replied that MAG has a federal charge for transportation planning. He added that the MAG Regional Council has taken on the responsibility as it has in the past.

Mr. Berry stated that he has been hearing about competing plans and ballot propositions. He asked who is going to push this into the end zone so it has the support and funding needed to be put on the ballot? Chairman Giuliano replied that the answer to Mr. Berry's question would be covered by a presentation to be given later in the meeting. He advised that because this group has representation from many areas, such as the legislature, business community, and local government, this will be the entity to pull all together and find consensus.

Mayor Keno Hawker stated that the examination by the Governance Task Force determined that MAG needed to be more inclusive, and that was the reason the TPC was formed.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that MAG is the federally designated MPO. She commented that enabling legislation is needed from the legislature to authorize an election. Vice Chair Scruggs noted that the legislation does not need to be specific, such as the split between modes, but just to allow the voters in Maricopa County to vote on a plan.

Mr. Dennis Smith stated that there are two elements to the sales tax issue: 1) Asking for authorizing legislation. 2) Seeking extension of the sales tax through an election. Mr. Smith noted that even if someone else helps create the plan, under MAG's federal designation, the plan would still have to come through MAG. He stated that the Governor's Vision 21 Task Force identified statewide needs and some statewide interests may be joining with MAG. However the legislation is packaged, if a project is regionally significant, it will need to be in the MAG plan. Mr. Smith added that the air quality conformity analysis is a required component that needs to be done through MAG. Transportation and air quality are linked and moving at the same time.

Chairman Giuliano stated that a statewide initiative may be an option, but we are not at the point of making that determination.

Expectations of Committee

Chairman Giuliano stated that as a part of the process, members were asked to submit "Things I Know," and "Things I Need to Know" about transportation. He added that not all had submitted responses, so other points could be added to the list as they were reviewed.

Kathy DeBoer, Vice President of WestGroup Research, reviewed the responses received on Things I Know: 1) MAG is in the process of developing a long-range transportation plan. 2) A multi-modal approach is necessary to keep pace with the congestion and air quality requirements of our growing metro area. 3) Phoenix has the ability to replace the RARF with a local tax if regional consensus cannot be reached. 4) The current regional transportation sales tax will end in 2005 and there is no enabling legislation that will approve an extension. 5) Travel demand will continue to grow. 6) We need a more comprehensive statewide solution to transportation. 7) There are limited financial resources. 8) I know my experience gives me an ability to determine good transportation siting and to make an effective case for such siting, particularly as it relates to the rural areas of our county and state. 9) I know a well constructed and managed highway or airport project from a project that is not. Good quality control is essential in the use of transportation funds. 10) Prioritization of alternative transportation means and integration is complex. 11) We need to extend the half cent sales tax to continue to address the transportation needs of Maricopa County. 12) We need consensus for the plan.

Chairman Giuliano added that there are differing values and approaches as to how to move forward. Realize this and come up with an approach agreeable to all.

Supervisor Don Stapley stated that the only legal way to do this is for the legislature to authorize a vote, and for the Board of Supervisors to vote to place the extension on the ballot. MAG cannot put this on the ballot. Supervisor Stapley stated that an alternative would be if the legislature created a Regional Transportation District that could put the extension on the ballot.

Councilmember Peggy Bilsten asked whether the County was the only entity that would need to approve. Supervisor Stapley replied that the election has to be authorized by the County.

Mr. Smith stated that there were two ways that the sales tax elections have been handled in the past. The 1985 election said the MPO does the plan and the County *shall* place on the ballot. The 1994 election said that the MPO does the plan and the County *may* place on the ballot. Chairman Giuliano stated that the language used depends on the legislature.

Representative Dean Cooley stated that the legislature places a measure on the ballot through a legislative bill, but needs to have enough detail to warrant a legislative bill. Mayor Woody Thomas commented that there could be a referendum process.

Ms. DeBoer reviewed responses to Things I Need to Know: 1) Will the RARF extension be local or statewide? If statewide, how will it be structured and what will be the split with rural towns? 2) What will be the split between transit and highways for any transportation tax? What are the best geographic and modal splits for new money to meet transportation needs? 3) How do municipalities prioritize their alternative transportation means? 4) What are the most effective projects to maintain regional mobility? 5) How can we work better together to develop a comprehensive plan that will be fair and functional to all communities within the region? 6) How can we improve our region's transportation alternatives sooner than later? 7) What political strategy will be employed to win a vote to fund transportation regionally or statewide? 8) How do you weigh the regional transportation needs against individual municipal needs? 9) What multi-modal solutions provide choices for customer needs and air quality standards? 10) Do all the cities and towns of Maricopa County have transportation plans and how is MAG creating consensus to put these plans together?

Mr. Smith stated that the RTP is looking at local plans and asking those not involved in the subarea studies for input. He added that all cities and towns have a transportation element in their plans.

Chairman Giuliano asked for further suggestions on things members needed to know.

Mayor Mary Manross asked if the timeline needed to be moved up because the legislature convenes in January. Chairman Giuliano stated that we have to move aggressively to meet the timeline. Mayor Thomas questioned the Committee's ability for getting too far along by January.

Mayor Hawker commented on separating transit from roadways. He asked if there would be one or two measures on the ballot—one for transit and one for roadways, or would they be considered together?

Representative Cooley expressed his concern for allocating too much to other modes if \$12 billion is projected for roadway needs, and the revenue is projected for only \$9 billion. He stated that one of the Vision 21 recommendations was to possibly merge MCDOT into ADOT. He noted that since municipalities occupy most of the County, there are fewer roads under MCDOT's responsibility. The idea would be to merge MCDOT into ADOT, who would take over the responsibility of planning for the County.

Mr. Roc Arnett commented on balancing the constraints with the desires of a city. He commented on utilizing a methodology or capability to help accelerate projects, such as privatization. Chairman Giuliano stated that non-traditional ways of advancing transportation projects might be done.

Mayor Hawker stated that the planning horizon and duration of the tax need to be determined.

Ms. Diane Scherer stated that the planning horizon is critical. If needs are undercapitalized, you are doomed to failure. She stated that maybe the Committee needs to look at how much is needed first.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that what the voters will accept is very important.

Representative Cooley stated that quality of life, landscaping, noise mitigation, maintenance, etc., need to be a part of the plan. He brought up a house bill passed last session requiring ADOT to do a performance-based

evaluation on projects. Representative Cooley stated that he would like a better definition of MAG's meaning of performance-based.

Supervisor Stapley stated that urbanization east into Pinal County needs to be considered.

Mr. Berry asked if the tax was for capital expenses and/or operational expenses of the system as well? Will there need to be a separate gas tax?

Mr. Arnett commented on helping competing entities understand, discuss differences and try to get early collaboration. Chairman Giuliano mentioned that he would be distributing a memo to members requesting projects. He commented that a meeting could be scheduled for discussion.

Mr. Benito Almanza stated that he has been participating in GPEC and those leaders had given clear support of the sales tax extension. However, identification of how to bring in those groups and State leaders is needed.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that members of the Greater Phoenix Business Coalition came to a WESTMARC meeting she attended and spoke about transportation and their recommendations. They indicated they will confine their activities to legislation to authorize the vote. They stepped back to let MAG develop the plan. She stated that they realize that the TPC will drive the process.

Councilmember Pat Dennis stated that Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) has indicated they are open to commuter rail. She stated that this organization needs to be included when discussions take place about multi-modalism.

Mayor Thomas stated that we know that the pressure is on. We need to know that people are out there talking and we need to pay attention to what those interests are.

Chairman Giuliano reviewed the meeting agenda.

Growth and Transportation Consequences

Eric Anderson gave a presentation on how growth impacts transportation. He displayed maps that showed growth throughout the region from 1934 through buildout in 2040. Mr. Anderson displayed aerials of various locations before and after development. He reviewed figures on changes in registered vehicles and daily vehicle miles of travel in the region; population density, size of freeway systems, and transit service in other metro areas. Mr. Anderson stated that the challenge for transportation planning is that vehicle travel is increasing faster than the population. He displayed maps of peak hour levels of service on the region's freeways and intersections. The maps showed the levels of the increase in congestion from the years 2000 to 2025.

Mr. Smith stated that MAG has been criticized for not having vision, with critics contending that because we have accepted each jurisdiction's general plan, it is not a vision. Chairman Giuliano stated that this is how it is supposed to work, because each jurisdiction is required to do a general plan and have it approved by the voters.

Vice Chair Scruggs expressed concern if this is a prevalent thought. Cities do general plans because they are legally required to do so. Chairman Giuliano stated that the Committee needs to know who has that

perception. Mr. Smith replied that the statements have been made by local planners working for cities. He added that it is not MAG's job to change approved local general plans.

Councilmember Bilsten suggested that MAG city managers could meet and take care of that perception at that level.

Mayor Thomas stated that if we think we are in a conundrum now, wait until all these plans are developed--that is when the vision comes in. He added that the metro area has plans approved for 13 million people. The onus will be on us to keep a good quality of life when the region is built out.

Mr. Arnett stated that each city has a plan, but each plan needs to have the cooperation of nearby cities. There is some extension into other boundaries. He commented that it is difficult to plan for others, but vision is being missed in getting true regional perspective--how does that apply to light rail, etc? Chairman Giuliano commented that Regional Council discussion may be needed on how that comes together.

Mayor Boyd Dunn stated that cities do look at neighboring cities, and try to incorporate land use, etc. into their plans.

Mayor Hawker stated that land use and transportation planning must be linked. You cannot build developments like Anthem and expect there not to be an impact 20 miles down the corridor. Mayor Hawker stated that a plan and analysis of the negative impacts are needed. The group doing the disruptive plan should pay for the mitigation of these impacts. He said that it seemed that cities are out doing their own things.

Mayor Manross stated that she has not heard anyone saying they do not want land use and transportation linked, just that individual communities have invested a lot in development.

Mr. Anderson stated that MAG staff does review general plans. In that review, they do review the linkages. He added that MAG staff works with city staff if there appears to be an issue or conflict. People think you must start with blank sheet to have true vision. But the reality is we already have three million people here and many approved planned area developments that will accommodate much future growth. Our ability to shift is limited.

Mayor Dunn stated that many cities have done plans to reduce density, but this has not necessarily happened in other areas. He stated that the question is how do we connect higher and lower density areas?

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the City of Glendale just completed planning for the western area of their city. She indicated that they have held residential density at 40 percent. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that Growing Smarter said that each city shall develop a general plan approved by the voters. There must be reliance by the voters that the plan cannot be changed without another election. She stated that there are not going to be quarterly elections in each city each time something may need to be changed. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that each plan has a transportation element and each city worked with its contiguous cities to ensure the transportation plans worked. The conversations saying there is no vision or no plan are untrue.

Chairman Giuliano asked if the map cannot be changed, what should concern this Committee--the process or the outcome? How is it tied to transportation planning?

Mr. Anderson replied that there are many factors in developing the transportation plan, and noted that the major transportation problem is commute traffic. The peak hour a.m. and p.m. commutes are where we are overusing existing capacity.

Mayor Dunn commented that transportation corridors pass through Pinal County and the Gila River Indian Community. He asked what discussions are taking place with those jurisdictions? Mr. Anderson replied that Pinal County is very active. They have co-sponsored the Southeast Transportation Study with MAG. MAG is doing a lot with CAAG and has a work group of MAG members and others outside the agency. He noted that the Gila River Indian Community has provided input into our process. Mr. Smith noted that there is a seat on the TPC for an Indian Community representative. He advised that the two Indian Communities had decided that the representative would be someone from Gila River, but have not yet submitted a name. Mr. Smith indicated that a letter could be written by the Chair to encourage their involvement.

Chairman Giuliano stated that the flow chart of the integration of area/modal studies represented all the pieces of information and studies that will be used to draft the RTP. He recalled that he was talking to someone who asked what other studies need to be conducted, to which he stated that we need no more studies. We are already doing many studies and they are quite comprehensive. Chairman Giuliano asked all if they could think of a piece not being studied, to suggest it. Mr. Anderson affirmed that any and all input is wanted.

Chairman Giuliano asked once the analyses were complete, would the TPC review them? Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. The studies are either complete or will be by the end of the year.

Mayor Thomas asked if each study would be discussed. Chairman Giuliano replied that was correct. If someone has questions, then we could return to the data to reach consensus.

Councilmember Bilsten suggested that staff can meet with new members on these studies to help them get up to speed. Mr. Anderson indicated that workshops to review the studies could be held as a prelude to policy discussion.

Mr. Smith commented that the plan being completed in 2007 was started in 1957 with no money. He explained that we need to have a 20-year plan that is financially constrained. Even if we do not have all the money, we can have a vision, called illustrative projects, on the table, so in the future, individuals will know what the vision was. Mr. Anderson noted that information from the studies is on the MAG Website. He stated that all these studies feed together and show needs in roadway, transit, alternative modes, ITS, and how we use technology to increase capacity. Mr. Anderson noted that there are quality of life aspects on the transportation side that we cannot forget, as Representative Cooley mentioned earlier.

Chairman Giuliano stated that should be a subpoint. This chart is just a skeleton outlining that the information from these plans will be the key way in which the RTP will come together. The quality of life should be in the gold box indicated on the diagram.

Councilmember Dennis stated that litter and maintenance might be a part of this as well. Mr. Anderson explained that maintenance was purposely not addressed because it is the State's responsibility. He indicated that shifting funds from HURF to the half cent sales tax for maintenance would be a major policy shift. Mr. Anderson noted that the question is how to pay for maintenance. He stated that ADOT's maintenance budget is appropriated annually by the state legislature.

Mr. Berry stated that he did not see goods movement addressed on the chart. Chairman Giuliano stated that could be added to the skeleton.

Mayor Thomas asked Mr. Berry to explain his perspective and how much communication he has had in these studies. Mr. Berry replied that his firm has had numerous solicitations to participate in numerous events and received extensive communications. Mr. Berry stated that rarely do they or the trucking industry participate. He advised that they definitely are being touched but everyone so busy working that it is difficult to get people to meetings. Mayor Thomas commented that it is a problem getting people to participate. They are invited, but do not attend. After approval of a plan, the leaders get grief for their decisions.

Chairman Giuliano stated that public participation is a component of this plan. He indicated that he wants a full blown advertising and communications effort to get the word out and get people to participate.

Mr. Berry stated that he has taken extraordinary lengths to get people to these events, but when they do not show up it is almost like a vote of confidence. People tend to show up only when there is a problem.

Mr. Anderson stated that discussions have taken place with BNSF on Grand Avenue commuter rail. They have indicated that they may be interested in relocating to decrease train traffic in the corridor.

Mr. Berry brought up interstate traffic going through the center of the city. Alternative routes for those not needing to travel through the center of the city need examination. Mr. Berry stated that capacity could be created by using underutilized routes. He stated that there is opportunity with SR 85 that has major bypass potential. Mr. Berry added that he was not suggesting using the half cent sales tax, but the TPC could look for ways to see how traffic can be moved off the network.

Mr. Anderson added that the MAG Regional Council did take action to accelerate SR 85 improvements last year because of safety concerns. He noted that the project acceleration is a little shaky right now, because of a decrease in federal funds. Mr. Anderson stated that if SR 85 became a divided highway, it could be a tremendous benefit. Mr. Berry noted that development would soon follow along the corridor.

Mr. Anderson reviewed the Phase II process. He noted that the basis is having goals and objectives, and then determining performance measures, followed by evaluation.

Representative Cooley stated that reaching a goal of maximum congestion relief would help him decide that this is the best option for spending money. Mr. Anderson replied that congestion relief is only one objective. He added that the whole plan cannot be driven with one objective. Representative Cooley noted that congestion relief is the issue of most concern to citizens. Mr. Anderson replied that there are many mobility needs among certain groups and areas of the Valley and that the TPC will need to decide what the balance will be. Those discussions will be very important.

Mr. Eneas Kane stated that the scope of work is important so quality decisions are made. The TPC needs to give the consultants direction so they know what the primary objectives are.

Mr. Smith stated that last year, MAG hosted the Western Region IPG Conference, and performance-based planning was one of the topics. He stated that two leaders in the field spoke on the topic and they said performance-based planning looks good on paper but in the end, there are qualitative decisions that need to be made.

Chairman Giuliano stated that staff has identified four transportation policy issues: 1) Selection of Phase II RTP Consultant, 2) Revenue Forecast, 3) Survey Information, and 4) Involvement of the Business Community. Mr. Anderson stated that the Revenue Forecast would be addressed later in the meeting with a presentation.

Mr. Anderson stated that as part of the RTP, one survey of the public is funded in Phase II of the RTP.

Mr. Smith stated that he and Mr. Anderson attended a Phoenix Chamber of Commerce meeting, which was also attended by Valerie Manning and Kevin Olson. The Chamber has indicated that they are subordinating governance issues and are supporting MAG process, because the extension is a more important issue. Chairman Giuliano asked if there were additional policy issues. None were noted. He stated that additional issues could be added at a later time.

Air Quality Challenges

Chairman Giuliano introduced Lindy Bauer, MAG Environmental Manager, who gave a presentation on air quality issues and challenges.

Ms. Bauer stated that transportation and air quality are linked, and both need to be successful to move forward and build new transportation projects. She stated that the two major challenges are conformity and the air quality lawsuit. Ms. Bauer first explained the air quality conformity requirements. She went on to speak about the projects needed to demonstrate conformity for PM-10, including PM-10 efficient street sweepers, paving dirt roads, shoulders, and access points.

Chairman Giuliano asked Ms. Bauer to clarify that if we are going to develop a plan, and if we are going to be able to implement the plan, we need to analyze up front the air quality impacts those projects will have. Ms. Bauer replied that Chairman Giuliano's statement was correct. MAG cannot approve any plan, program and project unless it passes the air quality conformity test.

Mr. Almanza asked for clarification if we have one project that goes over budget, is an adjustment needed to bring it below the budget? Ms. Bauer replied that was correct, MAG has to somehow bring it back under the motor vehicle budget. She added that the air quality modeling staff work closely with the transportation modeling staff. We are fortunate to have both transportation and air quality modeling housed under one roof.

Mr. Berry commented that 15 years ago, MAG made a key decision to bring modeling in house, which has proven to be a huge advantage. Mr. Smith noted that MAG is different from other organizations because we do the air quality plan that sets the budget. He cautioned that the change in the population projections will make conformity more difficult to achieve. Mr. Smith stated that we may be coming back to the TPC with some measures to make it work.

Councilmember Dennis asked if the projects currently in plan met standards? Ms. Bauer replied that was correct, thanks to the local governments who went above and beyond what was called for to get benefits that could be applied on the transportation side.

Vice Chair Scruggs clarified that Councilmember Dennis was asking if the subarea studies had been modeled. Ms. Bauer replied that individual modeling has not yet been done. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that it seemed that the number one goal is to stay within the air quality budget. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that we can plan all we want, but if we do not meet the air quality standards, we will be shut down.

Mayor Hawker asked the basis for the Serious Area PM-10 budget. Ms. Bauer replied that the basis is the air quality modeling which demonstrates attainment of particulate standards. The modeling attainment demonstration then produces a motor vehicle emissions budget for transportation. Mayor Hawker asked who sets the particulate standards. Ms. Bauer replied that the standards are set by the EPA. Ms. Bauer indicated that the annual PM-10 standard is 50 micrograms per cubic meter. All have the same standard.

Mayor Dunn asked if the standard is the same across the country? Ms. Bauer replied that was correct. Mayor Dunn spoke about his experience on the Air Quality Committee. He commented that it does not make sense that this region has to meet to the same requirements as other areas, such as Atlanta or Seattle.

Supervisor Stapley commented that if the Salt River monitor was moved somewhere else, the situation could improve.

Representative Cooley asked if the region was given credit from the federal government for airport emissions because of impact. Ms. Bauer replied when MAG does modeling, emissions from aviation are factored in. The federal government controls the emissions from aviation.

Representative Cooley asked if improvements in fuel and motors are assumed in the 20 year plan? Ms. Bauer replied those assumptions are very important. That is why MAG uses the latest state-of-the-art modeling, such as MOBILE 6, that have built in the new tailpipe standards and fuels.

Representative Cooley commented on the State Implementation Plan (SIP) in place. We have had several years of compliance with the SIP. He asked when we reach a point where it goes away, will a maintenance plan be written? Ms. Bauer replied that for right now we have five years of clean data for carbon monoxide and the one hour ozone standard. Presently, MAG is working on a carbon monoxide maintenance plan as well as for ozone maintenance of the standards through 2015. The data at the monitor needs to also be clean.

Representative Cooley asked how often does the EPA update the model? Ms. Bauer replied that there is no set rule for how often the EPA updates the model. She stated that EPA came out with MOBILE 6 in January 2002, and MAG has already implemented that model. These models are very sensitive. The same information can be run through two different models and the results can be different. MAG does many test runs to understand how the models work.

Chairman Giuliano asked who ultimately checks the math on the models? Ms. Bauer replied that the EPA, ADEQ, Western States Petroleum Industry, and Dave Berry have checked our math. Chairman Giuliano stated that the process is based on what we want to build and then they check to make sure it complies.

Vice Chair Scruggs asked Ms. Bauer the status of EPA wanting to change the PM-10 standard to the more stringent PM-2.5. Ms. Bauer stated that in this region, the County and State suspect that the region would be in compliance for PM-2.5.

Mayor Thomas stated that he reviewed exceedance data and it looked like in inverse relationships. The region has had success with carbon monoxide and ozone, but not with PM-10. Mayor Thomas asked if that provided any direction on how we proceed? Ms. Bauer replied projects like the street sweepers and paving dirt roads all help. She added that PM-10 is the most difficult. That is why MAG requests project submissions from member agencies for PM-10 street sweepers. Ms. Bauer stated that member agencies have also been very aggressive in paving dirt roads.

Mayor Thomas commented on speeding up the volume and speed of traffic. If more roads are built, more dust would be kicked up. Ms. Bauer stated that speed is better for ozone and carbon monoxide, but hurts in PM-10. We try to combat that situation by keeping dust off the roads in the first place.

Representative Cooley stated that a lot of freeways are built of concrete with depressions. Many want rubberized asphalt used for noise mitigation. He asked if rubberized asphalt would be better for dust control? Ms. Bauer replied that she would check and report back.

Mr. Rusty Gant asked how much of the problem is agriculture based? Ms. Bauer replied that the point where agriculture interfaces with development shows higher PM-10 levels. She added that when agriculture areas are retired, it does help with PM-10. Ms. Bauer stated that we also have to be careful when we build anything that we meet Rule 310 requirements to keep dust down. Mr. Gant asked if it is known how much of the PM-10 problem is agriculture based? Ms. Bauer replied that about one-third of the problem is agriculture based in the base year emissions. This will be reduced by the new agriculture best management practices. She added that a bigger problem for conformity is reentrained dust on the roadway.

Councilmember Dennis asked if industries were also creating a PM-10 problem. Ms. Bauer replied that rock products, sand and gravel, and utilities can also produce particulates. Councilmember Dennis asked if anything was being done to get them in compliance? Ms. Bauer replied that rock products are supposed to meet Rule 310, a rule that includes a variety of sources. She added that the County has stepped up efforts to ensure the Rule is being met. Industries also have air quality permits with Maricopa County.

Mayor Thomas asked for further detail on the violations at the Salt River monitor. Ms. Bauer replied that is a problem site. The area has intense industrial uses, and includes unpaved roads, the 19th Avenue landfill, and sand and gravel operations.

Mr. Berry stated that the site is right in the middle of the City of Phoenix bus maintenance yard. He added that the site is the focus of a study because of theories that the river bottom may move air as well. Mayor Thomas related that when Denver was having air quality problems you could see the pollution track followed the river.

Ms. Bauer reported that a lawsuit has been filed by the Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest. She stated that the lawsuit challenges the EPA's approval of MAG's air quality plan. Ms. Bauer stated that the brief has not been received, but issues are expected to include CARB diesel and more stringent agricultural measures. According to EPA, violations at the Salt River monitor might also be a factor. Ms. Bauer stated that Maricopa County and ADEQ are working on the site monitor readings. She noted that the City of Phoenix has poured a lot of effort into paving, landfill improvements, and vacant lot access. Mr. Smith commented on MAG using CMAQ funds as a strategy to solve air quality issues.

Representative Cooley expressed concern with aircraft emissions. He commented that flights over the Salt River monitor could cause problems. Representative Cooley indicated that he wondered why the region was not getting credit for what is a federal issue. Ms. Bauer replied that aviation has been a very small percentage of the problem, especially with carbon monoxide. She added that most of the aircraft in this region is newer and cleaner.

Representative Cooley asked if any readings were taken during the 3½ days following September 11, 2001 to determine if no planes made a difference in PM-10. Ms. Bauer replied that she would check with the County. Mr. Berry commented that weather may also be a factor.

Chairman Giuliano asked what are the best case and worst case scenarios in regard to the lawsuit? Ms. Bauer stated that the EPA feels they are on very solid ground with the plan. They believe new federal engine and clean fuel standards demonstrate a good national strategy. Ms. Bauer stated that if the Center wins and the court vacates the approval, major industries would be hit immediately. She stated that in next five months, three things would happen if the situation is not remedied: the loss of federal funds, stoppage of major transportation projects, and imposition of EPA's own plan.

Mr. Berry stated that there are two things we can do. We can sit and watch EPA handle the lawsuit or we can get involved and put the pressure on EPA to mount a defense against the lawsuit. Mr. Berry commented that it is winnable. He indicated that the best attorneys will be needed to win the lawsuit, otherwise, we will face sanctions with the lawyers in place.

Chairman Giuliano asked by what process could we enjoin the suit and provide representation? Mr. Berry replied that there are two courses of action: 1) Put pressure on Christy Todd Whitman and the EPA to give us the best representation they have. 2) The cities and industry need to contribute lawyers through ad hoc coordinating efforts to bolster the legal work being done by EPA. Mr. Berry stated that the strategy is "Let's win."

Chairman Giuliano asked Ms. Bauer how we are engaged in the legal process. Ms. Bauer replied that we are not currently engaged. The Center did not specify the grounds for the lawsuit in their petition. The Center's brief is due October 21, 2002.

Mr. Smith stated that a stakeholders group could be formed that would include interested attorneys, chamber attorneys, etc., to mutually share expertise and advice. Chairman Giuliano commented on determining a date when the issue would be agendaized for the Regional Council.

Mr. Berry suggested that a letter from MAG to the EPA saying this is a big deal for us would be helpful. Chairman Giuliano stated that the letter could be sent to the Governor as well.

Mayor Thomas related his City's experience in hiring an attorney on a rate case to determine if the case was going in their favor. He stated that an attorney could be hired to have our interests monitored. He commented on placing this as an item on the next Regional Council agenda.

Representative Cooley stated that from a legislative standpoint, when conformity was threatened, industry was on the legislators' backs saying you can't let this happen. He noted the importance of getting industry involved because they have a big stake in the outcome.

Ms. Bauer noted the possible court decision could take place in July 2003. She stated that state action may need to be taken on CARB diesel and more stringent agricultural measures. Ms. Bauer brought up that congressional relief may be received from HR 3880 for New York. Atlanta and St Louis also want to piggyback on the bill. Chairman Giuliano thanked Ms. Bauer for her presentation.

Planning Partners Perspectives

Mr. Ken Driggs, RPTA Executive Director, provided a report from the RPTA perspective. He stated that transit is in a better situation than ever before. Mr. Driggs stated that this is an opportunity for the region to get \$10 billion without an increase in taxes. He stated that he is optimistic it can be done. The prize is too big to not have this worked through. Mr. Driggs recalled that he was on the bus the other day and it was standing

room only. He realized that the last time the express bus route was expanded was by Lela Steffey 10 years ago. Mr. Driggs stated that these successes need to be broadened to the entire community, possibly even commuter rail, BRT, and light rail. No matter how funding comes, certain things are needed. He brought up that there is a one hundred percent farebox return on vanpools. He read an editorial that could potentially be written for this region. The editorial mentioned how the public would be clamoring for more rail lines once the initial lines are in place. Mr. Driggs stated that the editorial was written Sept 5, in Deseret News in Salt Lake City and it will be written here. Mr. Driggs stated that now is the time to go forward with a partnership where all will put the plan together. Mr. Driggs commended members for coming together.

Victor Mendez, ADOT Director, gave a presentation on ADOT's perspective of the Regional Transportation Plan. He reviewed ADOT's input to the MAG TPC process and the federal transportation funding reauthorization. Mr. Mendez stated that several objectives need to be kept in mind: the need to move people and goods in a safe and efficient manner; the need to improve the quality of life; reduce congestion; the need for a good multi-modal transit system; the need to continue the Freeway Service Patrol; and the need for maintenance.

Councilmember Bilsten asked if maintenance would include litter pickup? Mr. Mendez replied that yes, there are some unique maintenance requirements that need to be considered. Councilmember Bilsten stated that her constituents are upset with the litter on the freeways. She requested cost figures. Mr. Mendez replied that the cost is \$123,000 per mile. Maintenance is a significant issue.

Councilmember Dennis asked the lifetime of rubberized asphalt. Mr. Mendez replied that the federal government has not changed its rate policy. A few years ago the durability was estimated at 7-8 years, but we now believe that could stretch to maybe 11-12 years, so that might help in getting the federal government to change the standards.

Councilmember Dennis asked if call boxes were going to be looked at as part of the Freeway Service Patrol project. Mr. Mendez stated that call boxes are being considered for a portion of SR 93, although that segment may extend outside of Maricopa County. He brought up that ADA requirements and maintenance/security issues need to be considered.

Mr. Mendez discussed planned improvements to existing corridors, including I-10, I-17, US 60, Grand Avenue, SR 85 and SR 74. He noted that new facilities are planned, such as the South Mountain and Loop 303. Mr. Mendez added that the Southeast Valley, Southwest Valley and Williams Gateway areas are projected to have a lot of growth, and facilities for these areas may need examination. He added that improving transit systems also bears examination.

Councilmember Bilsten asked how many use vanpools? Mr. Driggs replied that in the Valley, there are approximately 300 vans, holding 9-15 passengers each. He noted that the vans are close to capacity, and the operating costs are paid totally by users. An expanded program could go a long way in a commuter package. Mr. Driggs added that Seattle has more than 1,000 vanpools.

Mr. Mendez stated that reauthorization is a critical issue. He then provided a review of the finance portion that included proposed allocations to the highway and transit programs.

Mr. Smith commented on the importance of reauthorization. He stated that a plan agreed to and supported by ADOT, Valley Metro and the regional planning agency is needed. Show a unified position so the legislature can say this is the consensus package out of Arizona.

Mayor Thomas commented on a statement that was made at Governance Task Force meetings that the ability to impose impact fees for freeways is virtually impossible. Mr. Mendez stated that impact fees were not impossible. He explained about the City of Marana working with Tucson. An interchange was wanted, so they implemented an impact fee with developers. Mayor Thomas stated that the interchange at Anthem only provided them better access. What was needed was capacity. They paid for the access, but not the impact to the freeway.

Mayor Hawker stated that an interchange is inexpensive, as compared to cost of the impact on the freeway system. Developers would prefer the option of paying for an interchange, but large developments can destroy other communities. They need to buy in that they have impact. Mayor Hawker stated that will be same situation on SR 85 and he believed that developers will say they will pay for access. Mr. Mendez stated that an equation for impact is not built into the methodology. They pay for access, not necessarily impact.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that no one can accurately determine impacts, but there are consultants you can hire. Hiring a professional in that field and assigning a portion of the cost to growth could be discussed. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that this could not be accomplished by any one agency.

Representative Cooley stated that he did not necessarily understand or agree with what has been said about Anthem. All growth impacts the entire system, because it is in the region. The growth as we have seen is throughout the Valley and impacts the entire system.

Mayor Thomas stated his agreement with Representative Cooley. Anthem is just an example. He commented on setting a level playing field for all, since all developments impact all of us. Mayor Thomas indicated that we may need to go to the state level for legislation on impact fees.

Funding Outlook—Where Do We Stand With the Plan

Mr. Anderson gave a presentation on transportation funding in the region. He referenced the material included in the TPC notebook.

Mr. Almanza asked how new funding sources would be included? Mr. Anderson responded that we have line items for highway and transit components. Through tax increases, the combination will probably fix this. The unmet need was \$9 billion which is now down to approximately \$5 to \$6 billion because Phoenix and Glendale passed their taxes.

Mr. Anderson reviewed HURF taxes collected from gas taxes and a portion of vehicle license taxes. He noted that people are driving more, but due to fuel economy improvements, fewer taxes are collected because fewer gallons are being used. Mr. Anderson stated that Department of Safety enforcement costs now come out of HURF funds, currently at more than \$60 million per year.

Mr. Driggs asked about the 15 percent money. Mr. Anderson replied that from the ADOT portion of HURF, 15.2 percent goes to controlled access facilities in Maricopa and Pinal Counties.

Mr. Anderson explained the Regional Area Road Funds (RARF) tax, which was passed in 1985. He stated that a lot of people think the RARF sales tax is just for the regional freeway system, but there is also an allocation to RPTA of \$7.5 million.

Supervisor Stapley asked for clarification of interest expense. Mr. Anderson replied this is the interest that the program has paid on bonds. Supervisor Stapley asked about city bonding costs. Mr. Anderson explained that if a city wants to accelerate a project, they put the money upfront. There is an interest sharing so the incentive is if we build faster, we could get a cost decrease. Mr. Anderson stated that interest costs are under five percent. We stitched together financing for the program from a variety of sources.

Chairman Giuliano asked if there was potential for a similar pie chart for the RARF extension? Mr. Anderson replied that work was soon to begin on that. He added that HURF and federal dollars are committed to the current freeway program. We should free up some of the HURF money in 2014. Chairman Giuliano asked if the first eight years have been spent. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct. He explained that GANS were issued to accelerate the program to 2007.

Mr. Smith stated that in regard to policy issues, we need to keep ADOT in the game on 15 percent funds. Also, are we putting federal funds into the system or returning them to the cities?

Mayor Thomas stated that he disagreed with 15 percent, it was more like 18 percent with the cost of interest. But if you are bonding you are even further away.

Mayor Hawker suggested doing a “lessons learned” from first 20 years. Mr. Anderson stated that we have learned a lot about right-of-way acquisition, interim construction, and dealing with the public, to name a few.

Supervisor Stapley stated that he would like to see an examination of issues that might make more sense being handled by privatization or partnering.

Councilmember Dennis stated that where Loop 303 is going in, developers are putting in \$25 million, not only for interchanges, but also for lanes. She commented that it is up to cities to recognize impacts on the rest of the region. Mr. Anderson stated that one major task that came out of the 2007 acceleration was to advance right-of-way acquisitions. Board Funding Obligations (BFO) was another innovation. Rather than investing in paper in New York, we bought from ourselves. Mr. Anderson noted that these are short term, one- to three-year notes. We have saved tens of millions of dollars by utilizing them.

Chairman Giuliano stated that clarification of revenue potential for the RARF extension is needed. Mr. Anderson replied that this is one of the tasks the consultant will undertake.

Mr. Anderson displayed a list of the local transportation sales taxes, from Phoenix, Glendale, Tempe, and Mesa. Mayor Manross added that Scottsdale passed a two-tenths of one percent tax in 1992 for surface transportation.

Polling Results

Ms. DeBoer gave a presentation on the survey on the RARF tax extension conducted in conjunction with Valley Metro and MAG. She stated that regional focus groups and a telephone survey were conducted. Both surveys indicated support for the extension of the tax. Ms. DeBoer stated that focus groups were held in Avondale, Glendale, Scottsdale, Mesa, and Phoenix, and pulled from the surrounding communities. She explained the process whereby responses were received. Ms. DeBoer stated that the telephone survey included 626 interviews.

Mr. Driggs asked if the language used in the survey indicated a combination of freeways/transit? Ms. DeBoer replied that the respondents were not provided with a split.

Mr. Smith asked if the respondents were provided with the fact that streets carry more capacity than freeways? Ms. DeBoer replied that they had not provided this information, but education on this topic could be helpful. Chairman Giuliano stated that this could possibly be a good baseline for followup polling.

Mayor Thomas stated that the signal synchronization issue has been brought up before and we have been told that 95 percent of our signals are synchronized. Have we maxed out our street transportation? We cannot succeed with synchronization if the traffic has maxed out the streets.

Election Issues and Strategies - Lessons Learned

Mary O'Connor, City of Tempe, gave a presentation on the lessons learned by Tempe on their transit tax election. The tax, which passed six years ago, followed two unsuccessful attempts at regional transit taxes. She added that the Chamber of Commerce and a citizens committee jointly proposed the election. Ms. O'Connor described the improvements that were communicated to the citizens via their monthly water bill. She stated that the keys to success were the involvement of the Chamber, the business community, and neighborhoods; a community based service plan; and a detailed five year implementation plan. Ms. O'Connor provided an overview of polling results: why people voted yes or no, and who voted.

Mayor Manross asked about the idea of a percent of commuters taken off the roads. Ms. O'Connor stated that in the plan was a target mode split of two percent, and aimed for 24 percent. She added that in corridors, the high school student usage was much higher than the mode split.

Mayor Thomas asked if light rail fit into the existing plan. Ms. O'Connor replied that would be a decision made through the Central Phoenix/East Valley EIS. She indicated Tempe is working with Scottsdale primarily in roadway improvements. The High Capacity Transit Plan with MAG is looking at commuter rail options. Ms. O'Connor noted that this does not fund regional commuter rail or a north/south corridor.

Mayor McDermott asked how much money was generated. Ms. O'Connor replied that they generated \$18 million the first year. She noted there has been a downward trend. Ms. O'Connor stated that they had a 10-year financial plan and a 20-year plan that they monitor regularly. Because the tax does not sunset and because of bonding, that kind of analysis is necessary.

Jack Tevlin, City of Phoenix, gave a presentation on lessons learned on his city's transit tax election. He displayed a map of the actual ballot from Transit 2000 that went to the Phoenix voters. Mr. Tevlin stated that the map showed when and where local bus routes would be expanded or created. He added that the map also showed BRT along freeways and 64 miles for light rail, 24 miles of which would be built in the first 17 years of this 20-year tax. Mr. Tevlin stated that bus ridership in Phoenix is approximately 40 million per year. Mr. Tevlin stated that ridership is affected by the frequency of service and convenience.

Ms. Scherer stated that Sunday service was not available before the ballot. When it started, hopes were for 9,000 to 14,000 riders on Sundays. Last Sunday there were 35,000 riders. So if you build it, they will come.

Representative Cooley stated that there is not usually a congestion problem on Sunday. Is the cost to maintain the system beyond what we receive from riders? He asked how much is user funded, and is it a good expenditure for the benefits? Mr. Tevlin stated that it was difficult to give a number, however, there were

35,000 riders because they had no other way to get around. He stated that this time last year, there were 35,000 people stuck in their homes. Most are people without access to an auto. Now there are 35,000 who can get to relatives, church and places because we offer Sunday service. On a workday, 150,000 ride. More of them do have access to a car.

Councilmember Bilsten stated that we do subsidize mass transit, but we also subsidize freeways. She noted that freeways are not congested much on Sundays, but we still have them.

Representative Cooley asked how many are you moving for the cost involved? Ms. Scherer stated that it is a quality of life issue.

Mr. Tevlin stated that we are now building around the margins. He brought up the promised Paradise Parkway, but there was little support for destroying neighborhoods. Mr. Tevlin stated that a new freeway will probably never be built in Phoenix, so what do we do to move around the margins? What services can we offer? Mr. Tevlin explained that prior to the 1984 Olympics in Los Angeles, officials were so afraid of gridlock, they asked people to use alternate transportation or stay home. He said that five percent of people elected not to use cars, and it made a huge difference in gridlock. Mr. Tevlin stated that there is a perception that 50 percent using alternative modes is needed to make a difference, but the story about the Olympics illustrates that only a small margin is needed to improve mobility.

Representative Cooley stated that his comments were not intended as a criticism of transit but were made from a business standpoint. He asked how much does it cost to move one person on Sunday and one person on Monday? Mr. Tevlin replied that the cost is approximately \$1.40 subsidy per rider every day. Representative Cooley stated that figures on these types of costs would help the committee make decisions.

Mr. Tevlin stated that the City needs to look at alternatives to move people if our citizens are not going to accept wider streets, and you can't build freeways through already developed areas.

Mayor Thomas stated that some costs cannot be attributed to dollars and cents. Mass transit does have impact. The amount of pollution per person is lessened if transit is used.

Ms. Scherer stated that the election passed because of the maps. The citizens were tired of broken promises. Many voters have come back with the maps and pointed out what was promised is shown right here on the map. Ms. Scherer indicated that the tax will succeed. We need to get together as communities and put plans together and show how they meld because many people are visual by nature.

Mr. Tevlin mentioned a letter from Mayor Rimsza that was sent out to 1,000 people that shows the improvements approved by voters. He noted that the only project not already approved on this map was the Rio Salado Parkway. Mr. Tevlin stated that the facility was added as result of a public hearing in Ahwatukee. Citizens asked why not build a parkway on Rio Salado to avoid putting people on I-10?

Councilmember Bilsten stated that the election was successful because the maps are what people wanted. They drew the lines. She added that the projects on the maps came from input received from Ms. Scherer's committee that held about 400 public meetings in a year and a half. Councilmember Bilsten stated that it is standing room only—people who want more transit oriented development. As we move forward, we need to take the plan to the public. The plan needs to reflect citizen needs and what they want. Chairman Giuliano stated that people support what they help to create.

Vice Chair Scruggs stated that “Glendale on Board” was the name of her city’s transit election. She stated that her citizens called the city after the Phoenix election was successful, angry because they wanted transit also. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that from the political perspective, there were four lessons learned from Glendale’s election. 1) The public needs to be receptive. 2) Elected officials, especially the mayor, need to be on board. 3) Have an active political action committee (PAC). 4) The PAC should retain a campaign consultant early in the process. She reviewed the plan for their half cent sales tax, which included support for transit and multi-modal operations.

Jim Book, Glendale Transportation Director, gave a presentation on the technical lessons learned during their election. 1) Timing is critical. The preference is a November ballot, not a September ballot. He explained this is attributed to the fact that people are on vacation just prior to September. 2) Utilize polling results. 3) Ensure adequate resources for process. 4) Form a multi-modal plan. 5) Be clear on funding and note the split. 6) Ensure accountability to the voters. 7) Create a simple ballot process. 8) Inform the public.

Councilmember Bilsten expressed her agreement with the importance of having a consultant who knows the area. She mentioned that the election was lost in 1997 because the consultant was from Los Angeles and did not listen to suggestions. It is important to find a consultant who knows the region, is on board at the beginning, and who understands and is willing to listen to people.

Mayor Dunn stated that the City of Chandler had an election in 1998 that was unsuccessful. They learned that leadership must come from elected officials. Timing is everything. Mayor Dunn stated that polling after the election showed that voters wanted to see freeways built first, but by 1998, not one mile had been built in Chandler. Mayor Dunn stated that one level needs to be addressed first before going to the next level. He stated that Chandler had updated its transit plan and will go out for another vote later.

Legislative Issues

Mr. Smith gave a presentation on legislative issues. He displayed a timeline of transportation related elections. Mr. Smith stated that after many unsuccessful attempts at passing a regional tax, cities went out on their own and passed individual taxes. Mr. Smith stated that the current half cent tax expires in December 2005. The tax, if extended for 20 years, would raise approximately \$9 billion, which we know is not enough. Mr. Smith commented that we might consider a 25-year tax, as Supervisor Stapley mentioned. He stated that existing state law recognizes that MAG develops the plan for the existing tax, sets the priorities, and approves cost and scope changes. Safeguards for the current tax are in state law.

Mr. Smith noted that some concerns have been expressed that the authorizing legislation needs to define the split between modes. He stated that some have suggested that the split not be placed in state law, but be determined through the planning process. Mr. Smith indicated that statewide interests are exploring joining with the Maricopa sales tax effort.

Representative Cooley stated that he understood various counties had the ability for legislative approvals to pass an increased tax. He asked for clarification on joining in. Mr. Smith explained that some tax rates are high, as shown on the statewide rate chart on the last page in the TPC manual. Joining up with Maricopa County might carry the plan. Chairman Giuliano asked if other cities might be invited to join. Mr. Smith stated that a coalition could be formed for dialogue.

Mr. Smith stated that the “Trust the MAG process” is being questioned. Some have suggested that the MAG Plan is needed before the authorizing legislation is granted.

Chairman Giuliano stated that with private sector and legislative participation in the process, it is not solely a MAG plan. The plan is not just MAG so maybe we need to get away from the terminology of “MAG Plan” and use “Regional Plan.”

Mayor Thomas stated that a plan may not be in time for the next legislative session, but we want and need to have a plan for the voters.

Mr. Smith stated that the landscape has changed. We cannot build in places that are most congested, the Paradise being a good example. He added that the plan needs to be developed to meet mobility needs, and a unified approach is needed with state and local governments and the business community to be successful.

Chairman Giuliano expressed that people support what they help to create. All are here to draw the tree. Chairman Giuliano stated that a letter will be going out soon requesting projects. He mentioned two RFQs for consultants are underway. One RFQ will be for a consultant who will help this group to get the message to constituencies. The consultant will be a public outreach firm that can help get editorials out after a meeting such as this. Chairman Giuliano stated that the plan will be communicated every step along the way. He stated that the second RFQ will be for a plan development advisor. As we go through the process and hand off to the PAC, we will have someone with that knowledge. He stated that the consultant will also be involved in direct mailings, etc. Chairman Giuliano stated that his thought was to get going on that right away because key messages need to be conveyed in a short time frame. He asked for clarification when the TPC would be taking action on the selected consultants. Mr. Smith replied that Kelly Taft, MAG Communications Manager, had drafted the RFQs. Depending on the review of the draft RFQs, the consultant selections could be back to the TPC by November.

Councilmember Bilsten commented that this needs to get done sooner rather than later. She mentioned that a press release could go out about the success of this meeting. Mr. Smith stated that the time frame would depend on how much time we want to give the consulting firms to respond.

Vice Chair Scruggs commented that the scope of work needs to be proactive as well as reactive. Chairman Giuliano stated that everything, from editorial board meetings to the e-mail database, needs to be very comprehensive.

Mr. Kane asked about the budget to hire consultants. Chairman Giuliano replied that funds were included in the MAG budget.

Mr. Smith mentioned that there are legal issues. Our campaign efforts are subject to the same restrictions as cities. Mr. Smith stated that we can have an information consultant or a plan development advisor, but we cannot lobby. At campaign time, it would have to be handed off to the PAC.

Representative Cooley commended MAG for creating the TPC. He expressed concern that the majority of the Committee remains mayors, and the plan will be taken to the Regional Council, which is mostly mayors, for approval. News releases will mention that legislators and the private sector were involved, but he was unsure how much impact the five presently sitting at the table will have in the true sense of a regional program. Representative Cooley stated that he would like to see consensus on a plan that benefits all in the Valley.

Chairman Giuliano stated that he understood Representative Cooley's concerns, but past performance does not go beyond 8:30 a.m. this morning. He stated that his expectation was that the legislators and business leaders will have a significant influence in the plan.

Mr. Kane stated that he was impressed with the amount of outreach that formed the Glendale and Phoenix plans. He asked if a process was in place to obtain more input and broaden the base? Chairman Giuliano replied that the issue for us will be the public engagement process, which has not yet been formulated. He added that the public affairs consultant would assist on this task.

Vice Chair Scruggs mentioned that a number of the private sector Committee members were unable to attend the retreat. The private sector members were chosen because they had regional expertise. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the top executives of businesses that do business throughout the region were considered. She noted that the mayors have not had anything to do with the studies being conducted. The studies are staff going out and talking to citizens. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the studies' results will be what the communities want and we need to keep that in mind. Who is going to vote on this, and who can best influence those constituencies? Vice Chair Scruggs stated that you have five representatives from huge constituencies who will benefit from improved transportation. To say that we only represent our area is missing the idea. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that MAG is not trying to be parochial at all. She commented that citizens know and trust their mayors and if we make the case, they will respond favorably. Vice Chair Scruggs stated that the citizens tell us what is needed in the plan. The end result will be a plan they approve, rather than a plan that is predetermined. She commented that she thought MAG's past performance has been pretty good, in light of the economic downturns. Considering that whole corridors were ripped off maps, MAG has put them back in, added a tremendous amount of miles that were not in the original plan, and will finish the plan in the time required.

Mr. Smith stated that of the TPC members, Mr. Gant is a resort business owner, in addition to representing ADOT. He stated that 10 out of the 25 members are not mayors.

Chairman Giuliano commented that, as he expressed at the beginning of the meeting, this is an experiment and an opportunity. This is a way to get regional consensus and support in developing the RTP. He stated that there is not a lot of room for error. If you want to think about what will happen to this region if the sales tax is not extended and we cannot improve transportation infrastructure, that is not an acceptable alternative.

Vice Mayor Schweiker stated that those who are elected do other things in life. He stated that as a business man, he gives consideration to anything that affects tourism, which is very important to us. Elected members have a larger representation than what is stated on nameplates.

Representative Cooley stated that he had high expectations for what the Committee will accomplish. He stated that he has been a participant in the past, and until there is performance, he had a little reservation. Representative Cooley commented that, as Councilmember Bilsten stated earlier, Phoenix putting a limit on their half cent tax keeps their feet to fire if they want to extend their tax. They have a greater responsibility to perform than Glendale. Representative Cooley stated that he was excited to be a part of the process and confident that the TPC will come up with a great plan.

Questions and Wrap Up

Meeting times were discussed. A consensus was reached to hold the meetings on the second Wednesday at 5:00 in the evening. It was decided that a light meal would be served. The next meeting of the TPC was

scheduled for October 23, 2002, at 5:00 p.m. It was noted that December 11th would conflict with the Regional Council meeting and November 13th would conflict with a conference in Tucson.

Mr. Smith asked how much involvement the Committee wanted by the MAG Transportation Review Committee (TRC) on the scope of work or RFQ? Chairman Giuliano replied that the TRC technical advisement was desired. If needed, special meetings of the TRC could be scheduled. Chairman Giuliano stated that the grids and timelines would be updated as changes occurred.

Mayor McDermott expressed that his most serious concern was the PM-10 lawsuit. Direction was given for staff to come up with a letter writing campaign. Mr. Smith stated that a report would be provided at the next meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary